



California Department of Water Resources Central Valley Flood Protection Plan Public Workshop Summary

DATE: Wednesday, June 24, 2015
WORKSHOP: 1:00 to 4:00 p.m.
LOCATION: Richard T. Conzelmann Community Center at Howe Park
2201 Cottage Way, Sacramento, CA 95825

I. Introduction – Workshop Overview and Participants

The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) held a public workshop on June 24, 2015 focused on the development of the 2017 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan Update (CVFPP Update). The workshop provided updates about CVFPP Update planning activities, including the Conservation Strategy, the Basin-Wide Feasibility Studies (BWFS) and Regional Flood Management Planning (RFMP). The workshop also highlighted the state's outcome-based approach to water management. The workshop agenda can be found in Appendix A.

The stated objectives of the workshop were to:

1. Provide updates about development of key components of the 2017 CVFPP Update, including the Conservation Strategy, Basin-Wide Feasibility Studies and Regional Flood Management Planning
2. Define the purpose, scope, timing and relationship of/between CVFPP Update components
3. Discuss DWR's proposed outcome-based planning approach and articulate the state's intended outcomes for flood management
4. Solicit questions and comments from workshop participants
5. Identify next steps in the CVFPP Update development process

Over 110 participants attended the workshop, including members of the public, DWR staff and supporting consultants. A wide array of stakeholder interest areas were represented, including local flood agencies, environmental interests, participants in the RFMP processes and state and federal agencies. Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) members in attendance included Bill Edgar, Jane Dolan, Clyde McDonald, and Emma Suarez. A full list of participants is included in Appendix B.

This document summarizes the presentations made during the workshop, as well as questions and comments received and responses provided. It is not intended to serve as a detailed transcript of all comments made.

Gary Bardini, DWR deputy director for Integrated Water Management, and Bill Edgar, CVFPB president, provided opening remarks, emphasizing the importance of integration and alignment in the CVFPP Update development process. Mike Mierzwa, the state's lead flood management planner, and Stacy Cepello, from the DWR FloodSAFE Environmental Stewardship and Statewide Resources Office (FESSRO), welcomed participants and introduced their respective staff.

II. CVFPP Development Update

CVFPP Purpose and Objectives

Mike Mierzwa provided an overview of the CVFPP purpose and objectives sharing that, overall, the CVFPP is a comprehensive vision for sustainable flood management and investment. The CVFPP provides recommendations to guide near- and longer-term State activities within the State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC). Mike noted that the CVFPP is not a decision document and that it will be updated in 5-year cycles, with 2017 being the first update.

Mike described that the primary goal of the CVFPP is to improve flood risk management by reducing the chance of flooding and damages once flooding occurs and to improve public safety, preparedness and emergency response. Mike shared that the supporting goals of the CVFPP are to improve operations and maintenance (O&M), promote ecosystem functions, improve institutional support and promote multi-benefit projects.

Mike reviewed the five planned chapters of the 2017 CVFPP Update and noted the following key points:

- **Chapter 1 – Setting Historical Context, Outlining Goals:** provides an overview of why there is a CVFPP and the SPFC.
- **Chapter 2 – Summary of Refinements and Areas of Alignment:** summarizes how the major flood-related policies, plans and activities converge together.
- **Chapter 3 – Strategies to Improve System Management:** outlines the types of investments and actions, both near-term and longer-term, which will be considered and bundled to create recommended regional and system-wide flood investment portfolios.
- **Chapter 4 – Investment Approach:** focuses on identifying implementation challenges and opportunities as well as a sustainable financing strategy.
- **Chapter 5 – Measure Outcomes and Performance of Investment:** provides an approach about how to measure value over time on flood investments, and serves as a prelude to the 2022 CVFPP Update.

Mike reviewed a timeline of the 2017 CVFPP Update development process and shared that the key next steps are to release atlases for the San Joaquin and Sacramento River Basins by fall 2015 and to complete draft BWFS reports by the end of 2015.

Summary of Clarifying Questions and Responses on the CVFPP Purpose and Objectives

- Question (Q): When will the public draft of the Conservation Strategy be released?
 - Response (R): The public draft Conservation Strategy will be released very soon. A specific date is unknown.

Conservation Strategy Update

Stacy Cepello provided an update on the Conservation Strategy. He stated that the purpose of the Conservation Strategy is to provide a comprehensive, long-term approach to improving riverine habitat and floodplains. The Conservation Strategy outlines how to improve ecosystems beyond mitigation and is designed to improve project delivery, reduce long-term costs and to attract funding from other sources.

Stacy shared that the guiding principles of the Conservation Strategy are to improve dynamic hydrologic processes, increase and improve habitat quantity, diversity, quality and connectivity, contribute to the recovery and sustainability of native species and reduce stressors that negatively affect at-risk species. He described that the key components of the Conservation Strategy, such as the targeted species plans and fish migration opportunities, help define existing conditions, needs and opportunities.

Stacy then described the measurable ecological objectives that were developed to provide a magnitude of improvements to aim for in multi-benefit projects. The measurable objectives were developed by analyzing historical data, existing conditions, species and habitat needs, and considering where opportunities exist within the SPFC. Stacy also shared how the Conservation Strategy can be applied to the outcome-based planning process, including the development of portfolios/bundling, funding, permitting/implementation and tracking.

A 60-day comment period on the Conservation Strategy will begin once all appendices are released. The Conservation Strategy and its appendices can be accessed on the DWR website at: http://www.water.ca.gov/conservationstrategy/cs_new.cfm.

Summary of Clarifying Questions and Responses on the Conservation Strategy Update

- Q: How can DWR make integration transparent so stakeholders know integration is occurring in a way that is beneficial to them?
 - R: At this point in the CVFPP development process, a lot of the work has been very technical in nature. One way to be transparent about integration is to put more of the technical information in front of various stakeholders and share examples, including how conservation has been incorporated in the BWFS work. By getting information in front of stakeholders, DWR can incorporate their feedback and improve the CVFPP development processes.
- Comment (C): Stakeholders might not see the outcome of these planning processes until the draft 2017 CVFPP Update is publicly available. That might be too late for stakeholders to then incorporate elements of the update into their proposed projects and other flood management activities.
- C: Fantastic work has been done on the Conservation Strategy. When the Conservation Strategy is published, stakeholders need to know how to apply the Strategy to the physical footprint of flood processes. The Conservation Strategy can serve as a blue print for how to incorporate conservation.

Basin-Wide Feasibility Studies Update

Eric Tsai, from DWR's Central Valley Flood Planning Office (CVFPO), provided an overview of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Basin-wide Feasibility studies noting that the two studies are distinct because the two basins function differently and will require different scale of actions. Eric stated that the purpose of the BWFS is to refine the scale and location of major system improvements for flood management, to integrate environmental conservation with flood system improvements and to evaluate system-wide hydraulic and economic benefits/impacts.

Eric noted that the scope for the Sacramento Basin study focuses on weir and bypass system improvements, and that DWR is working closely with the Lower Sacramento/Delta North RFMP, the BiOps Program and other planning efforts to ensure that the programs and proposed actions regarding the Yolo Bypass are aligned. Eric described that the Sacramento Basin study next steps include evaluating

and comparing the Yolo Bypass options and a range of upstream actions, continuing to engage stakeholders, formulating a State-Preferred Plan and developing a draft BWFS by the end of 2015.

Eric shared the following lessons learned from the Sacramento Basin study:

- The flood system needs to be modernized to meet today's needs and be resilient to future changes.
- Sacramento and Fremont Weir expansions can provide significant cross-regional stage reduction.
- Yolo Bypass setbacks would provide varying levels of flood and ecosystem benefits.

Eric then provided an update on the San Joaquin Basin-wide Feasibility Study, sharing that the focus in this basin is on system projects and larger scale regional projects. DWR is currently assembling a diverse portfolio of potential management actions and exploring how these actions perform and fit together. Eric shared that DWR will also identify a State-Preferred Plan for the San Joaquin by analyzing both system and regional projects (i.e., larger-scale actions proposed by the local RFMPs) and evaluating the actions' benefits, costs and tradeoffs.

Eric shared the following lessons learned from the San Joaquin Basin Study:

- If nothing is done to upgrade the flood system, the effects of problems such as sea-level rise, climate change and subsidence will likely get much worse.
- A diverse portfolio of multi-benefit actions is needed.

Eric described that the San Joaquin Basin study next steps include evaluating and comparing system configurations, continuing to engage stakeholders, formulating a State-Preferred System Configuration, and developing a draft BWFS by the end of 2015.

Summary of Clarifying Questions and Responses on the Basin-Wide Feasibility Studies Update

- Q: For the San Joaquin Basin study, how is DWR integrating with the San Joaquin River Restoration Program (SJRRP)?
 - R: DWR is coordinating with the SJRRP and working to identify areas that have a strong nexus between the Basin-Wide study and the SJRRP. Firebaugh is an example of where CVFPP goals and SJRRP goals share a strong nexus. Other SJRRP projects, such as the Reach 2B project, don't have as strong of a flood nexus so DWR is tracking progress. The SJRRP Reach 4B project is another area of potential alignment. DWR has been collaborating with CVFPB to explore the flood benefits of a potential Reach 4B project.
- Q: Is DWR incorporating upstream storage into the San Joaquin BWFS?
 - R: Yes, DWR is investigating potential upstream storage as a potential long-term flood system resiliency action to address future climate change. Upstream storage represents a broad portfolio of actions that could include reservoir reoperation, increasing objective release, conjunctive use, off-stream storage, and other upstream storage actions. Two of the current draft system configurations have no additional upstream storage and one system configuration includes some potential upstream storage actions.
- Q: Bypass expansion meets many ecosystem objectives and can provide multiple benefits. How are DWR's CVFPO and FESSRO divisions working together on activities along the main stem of the Sacramento River?
 - R: The 2017 CVFPP will be integrating RFMP projects into the broader portfolio of actions. These projects include actions along the main stem Sacramento River. However,

other projects not identified in the RFMP's can still be reflected in the 2017 CVFPP. The Sacramento BWFS, however, is currently focused on the bypasses and weirs in the Sacramento Basin.

- C: If DWR has conservation objectives where the flood system is the main mechanism of impact on ecosystem, the conservation objectives are achieving flood benefits as well. The portfolio of actions approach is an effective approach because there may be projects where the flood risk reduction component is less but the conservation opportunity is much higher. The activities should be looked at holistically and not piece meal.
- C: DWR's outreach efforts should continue to occur and should be increased around work along the Yolo Bypass. I encourage DWR to develop coordinated and regional partnerships and work with stakeholders through key issues such as existing land use, downstream impacts, drainage impacts, etc.
- C: The Lower Sacramento/Delta North RFMP identified habitat restoration projects along the main stem and does not have the funds to implement these projects. Local stakeholders hope DWR will review those projects and are willing to work with DWR on both habitat actions and flood actions.
 - R: DWR will continue to engage and collaborate with local stakeholders and the Lower Sacramento/Delta North RFMP through the CVFPP.
- C: Landowners are doing innovative work in the Sacramento Basin bypasses. They know the system and land cover, and should be engaged as well.

Regional Flood Management Planning Update

Mary Jimenez, from DWR CVFPO, provided an update on the RFMP process. She described that the RFMP process is a multi-phase regional planning effort intended to gain local/regional perspective on achieving the CVFPP goals and identifying regional priorities. Mary shared that Phase 1 of the RFMP process – during which regional plans that reflect the local stakeholders' vision for how to reduce flood risk were developed – is now complete with all six RFMPs submitting plans.

Mary explained that DWR has completed an initial assessment of the plans to establish a dataset from which portfolios of management actions can be built, to evaluate the breadth and diversity of actions and to inform the CVFPP Investment Strategy. Mary defined that management actions is an all-encompassing term to cover the many different types of projects proposed by the regions. Mary shared that management actions can include O&M projects, repair and rehabilitation projects, governance actions, permitting solutions, GIS mapping, etc. When performing the initial assessment, DWR looked for consistency with Phase 1 scope and CVFPP priorities, details about locally supported management actions, how the actions contributed to CVFPP goals and the actions' potential for bundling.

Mary then reviewed results of DWR's initial assessment of the RFMP plans, noting the following key items:

- Almost 600 management actions were identified, totaling approximately \$13.9 billion.
- The majority of identified actions are related to operations, maintenance, replacement, repair, and rehabilitation (OMRR&R) or in-place improvements (i.e., improvements to levees and channels).
- There were more near-term actions (within 10 years of 2015) in the San Joaquin basin than the Sacramento basin.
- In both basins, the majority of actions are in rural areas.

Mary noted that during Phase 2 of the RFMP process, there will be opportunities for refinement. She shared that approximately 80 percent of the proposed actions/projects are either conceptual or in the planning stage and more details will need to be developed. Mary also noted that there is a need for bundling the proposed actions to achieve the intended outcomes for flood management and that there will be opportunities to partner.

Mary stated that summaries of the initial assessment will be compiled into binders and shared with the RFMPs in August and September 2015. There will also be a session on the RFMP process at the Floodplain Management Association (FMA) Conference on September 8-11, 2015 at the Westin Mission Hills Hotel in Rancho Mirage, California. Phase 2 activities will begin in September 2015 and will continue through spring 2016 for incorporation in the 2017 CVFPP Update

Summary of Clarifying Questions and Responses on the RFMPs Update

- C: When Phase 1 of the RFMPs was developed, the Conservation Strategy's measurable objectives were not yet made public and therefore could not be integrated into the RFMPs. If DWR is relying on the RFMPs to propose activities that will benefit the ecosystem along the main stem, the RFMPs need to have enough time to incorporate these measurable objectives.

III. Outcome-Based Planning

Mike Mierzwa explained that DWR is proposing an outcome-based approach to water management, an approach that uses intended outcomes as the foundation for planning and the criteria for evaluating potential management actions. In the context of flood, Mike described the following intended outcomes of the CVFPP:

- **Public Safety:** reducing expected lives lost or injured from flooding.
- **Economic Stability:** balancing risk and reward on floodplains, achieving effective investments for water management.
- **Ecosystem Vitality:** improving habitat quality and quantity; maintaining abundance and diversity of native species.
- **Enriching Experiences:** supporting cultural, societal or aesthetic values including culturally significant farmland.

Mike explained that the CVFPP goals are linked to and also contribute to the state's flood management goals and to the broader societal goals/intended outcomes for water management. The CVFPP is an ongoing planning process that seeks to identify, create, adapt and improve portfolios of actions that meet more specific CVFPP objectives and contribute to the intended outcomes for state investments in flood and water management in California.

Mike further explained that the CVFPP will identify actions that meet the intended outcomes in a way that is resilient to future changing conditions and stressors, are most cost effective for California taxpayers and are supportive of disadvantaged communities and tribes. Mike noted that integration is inherent and necessary to outcome-based planning and the development of the 2017 CVFPP Update.

Mike then provided an overview of how outcome-based planning is being applied to develop the CVFPP Update. A process graphic (which was shared during the workshop) outlining the following steps is included as Appendix C.

- **Collection of Potential CVFPP Management Actions:** includes initial list of actions from BWFS, RFMPs, resources agencies, regulatory agencies, non-government organizations (NGOs) and others.
- **Assess Proposed Management Actions:** potential actions are evaluated for their potential to meet CVFPP goals and broader societal intent, and the ease with which they could be combined with other actions to do so.
- **Selection of Actions with Potential State Interest:** actions will then be organized by basin and region, characterized by scale and their potential to meet the intended outcomes and implementation timeline.
- **Develop and Evaluate Portfolios:** The effectiveness of any one action cannot be evaluated without considering dependencies and interactions with other actions in the same region or basin. Actions may be combined with others into action portfolios that will be more cost effective and resilient toward achieving the State's intended outcomes for flood management. This process should be informed by diverse communities of practice, and expertise from various State and Local partners.
- **CVFPP Update:** the CVFPP Update will include recommended investment portfolios that include near and longer term actions, region and system-wide projects, and that include some or all types of improvements such as system-scale, urban, small communities, rural/agricultural and residual risk management improvements.
- **Implement CVFPP Recommendations:** the effectiveness of the recommendations included in the CVFPP Update will be measured and tracked so that actions can be modified to better achieve intended outcomes through future CVFPP planning cycles.

IV. Next Steps for CVFPP Development

Mike reviewed the following key next steps in the development of the 2017 CVFPP Update:

- Continue to refine BWFS and Conservation Strategy; complete RFMP Phase 1 assessment.
- Assess potential management actions, develop and evaluate portfolios.
- Discuss outcome-based planning in the context of flood management.

Mike also described that DWR will continue to communicate and engage various stakeholders through monthly CVFPB briefings and at Coordinating Committee meetings; regular briefings with other stakeholder groups; the RFMP listening tour planned for Summer 2015; the FMA Conference in September 2015; and future CVFPP workshops.

Summary of Clarifying Questions and Responses on Outcome Based Planning and Next Steps for CVFPP Development

- C: The idea of integration comes down to an actual protocol between conservation and the floodplain. The NGO community can work with DWR in a collaborative manner on how to integrate conservation and flood actions.
- C: Landowners in particular will have to live with the ramifications of the actions incorporated into the CVFPP; it is crucial that they be engaged.
- C: Many of the disadvantaged communities (DACs) are prominent areas of agriculture and that should be remembered when evaluating activities in those areas.

- C: There should be a common definition of multi-benefit projects; it may have different meanings for different stakeholders.
- C: The economic ramifications of some of these projects are huge; DWR should show transparency in how these effects will be addressed.
- Q: There are 1,600 miles of levees in the SPFC. Are all of the levees up for review or only the ones that DWR does not have current activities on?
 - R: DWR is primarily looking at the needs of areas that haven't been addressed yet. Because the CVFPP is an iterative process, there will always be a planning process to look at the needs and opportunities that exist. DWR should also look at activities that have been done before because stressors will change over time.
- C: The objectives in the Conservation Strategy were described as looking at the historical level of species and habitats, the needs of where the species should be and then the opportunity that exists. It would be more helpful to see the amount of mitigation that is needed to implement flood projects, and how much would actually have to be done. DWR could start with the mitigation standard in flood actions and then look at ways to incorporate conservation. This approach could be more useful for getting projects permitted and implemented.
- C: There is a lot of local knowledge about the system. DWR and other resource agencies can utilize this knowledge to achieve the intended outcomes. Mitigation alone will not achieve the intended outcomes but it will play a very important role.
- C: There will continue to be a greater mitigation burden as species' conditions continue to decline. Just doing mitigation will drive costs up in the long-term; everyone needs to be more proactive. There is a great wealth of information among the stakeholders and there needs to be more discussion about what the needs are and how to apply different standards. Flood risk reduction objectives can create a vision for integration, but there needs to be a more interactive forum where stakeholders and DWR can discuss large issues in an effective way.
 - R: The suggestion of having more interactive discussions with stakeholders is appreciated. DWR can be a catalyst to have focused discussions, with support from the CVFPB as well. A lot of collaboration has occurred thus far, and will continue.

Appendix A - CVFPP Public Workshop Agenda



California Department of Water Resources Central Valley Flood Protection Plan Public Workshop

DATE: Wednesday, June 24, 2015
CHECK-IN: 12:45 to 1:00 p.m.
WORKSHOP: 1:00 to 4:00 p.m.
LOCATION: Richard T. Conzelmann Community Center at Howe Park
2201 Cottage Way, Sacramento, CA 95825

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES:

- Provide updates about development of key components of the 2017 CVFPP, including the Conservation Strategy, Basin-Wide Feasibility Studies and Regional Flood Management Planning
- Define the purpose, scope, timing and relationship of/between CVFPP components
- Discuss DWR's proposed outcome-based planning approach and articulate the state's intended outcomes for flood management
- Solicit questions and comments from workshop participants
- Identify next steps in the CVFPP development process

AGENDA:

#	Min	Start Time	Item	Presenter(s)
1.	15	1:00 p.m.	Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Opening remarks• Agenda review• Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gary Bardini, DWR• Bill Edgar, CVFPB• Facilitator
2.	80	1:15 p.m.	CVFPP Development Update <ul style="list-style-type: none">• CVFPP purpose and objectives• Where are we in the CVFPP development process?• Updates on CVFPP components<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Conservation Strategy○ Basin-Wide Feasibility Studies○ Regional Flood Management Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mike Mierzwa, DWR• Stacy Cepello, DWR• Eric Tsai, DWR• Mary Jimenez, DWR

#	Min	Start Time	Item	Presenter(s)
3.	10	2:35 p.m.	Break	
4.	60	2:45 p.m.	Outcome-Based Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DWR's proposed approach to outcome-based planning and the importance of integration • Intended outcomes: Public Safety, Ecosystem Vitality, Economic Stability, Enriching Experiences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mike Mierzwa, DWR
5.	15	3:45 p.m.	Next Steps for CVFPP Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where we're headed • Future CVFPP communications and engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mike Mierzwa, DWR
6.	-	4:00 p.m.	<i>Adjourn</i>	

Appendix B – List of CVFPP Public Workshop Participants

CVFPP Public Workshop Participants		
Last Name	First Name	Organization
Amrhein	Shelly	DWR
Andrews	Betty	ESA
Armstrong	Gardner	Land Owner
Arrich	Jeremy	DWR
Barker	Kelley	CDFW
Bartlett	Joe	DWR
Bernardy	Todd	DWR/DFR
Bindra	Amy	DWR
Black	Karen	DWR
Brown	Doug	Douglas Environmental
Burkholder	Anna	CDFW
Burroughs	Davis	Farm Bureau
Carter	Denise	Colusa Co.
Chao	You Chen (Tim)	Delta Stewardship Council
Chew	Lori	DWR - FESSRO
Churchwell	Roger	SJAFCA
Dacus	Larry	TRLIA/MBK
Davenport	Jessica	Delta Stewardship Council
Doe	Steve	DWR
Dolan	Jane	CVFPB
Eclana	Russ	DWR SMY
Ellis	Tom	Landowner
Engler	Tom	MBK Engineers
Farley	S. Greg	DWR
Floyd	Kim	KF Communications
Fock	Anna	DWR
Ford	David	Ford Enges
Ford	Gina	CDFW
Fordice	Steve	RD784
Forrest	Bill	City of Galt
Frame	Jonathan	RD -999
Frederickson	Justin	CA Farm Bureau
Fritz	Chris	PBI
Gala	Satya	GEI
Gallagher	Leslie	CVFPB
Gardiner	Rachel	ICF International
Gettleman	Ben	Kearns & West
Ginney	Eric	ESA
Giottonini	Jim	SJAFCA
Greco	Steve	UC Davis
Haile-Selissie	Samson	DWR/CVFPO

Last Name	First Name	Organization
Hardesty	Mike	RD 2068/CCVECA
Hegedus	Anna	DWR
Henderson	Adam	DWR-FESSRO
Henery	Rene	Trout Unlimited
Herink	James	DWR -OCC
Herota	James	CVFPB
Hobbs	Jennifer	USFWS
Hopkins	Jane	FEMA
Howard	Vance	AECOM
Hunter	John	H.T. Harvey
Hurd	Callie	State Parks
Inamine	Mike	SBFCA
Jewell	Michael	USACE
Jones	Dustin	DSSC
Katz	Jacob	CalTrout
Keatry	Brian	Placer County Flood Control
Koch	Eric	DWR
Larsen	Derek	LWA
Leon	Abimael	CDFW -Region 4
Lorenzo-Lee	Maria	DWR
Luna	Adolfo	DWR
Macdonald	Clyde	CVFPB
Marino	Len	CVFPB
McNeil	Sean	Mead & Hunt
McNearney	Leah	DWR-FESSRO
Melcer	Ron	DWR - FESSRO
Morgan	Joshua	San Joaquin River Conservancy
Moss	Brady	AECOM
Murray	Loren	AECOM
Musto	Cassandra	DWR
Myers	Ken	AECOM
Nelson	Natasha	DWR - FESSRO
Ng	Michele	DWR - CVFPO
O'Regan	Barry	KSN INC
Ortega-Jewell	Nicole	USACE
Oslick	Harvey	Wood Rodgers
Pappalardo	Emily	DCC Engineering Co. Inc.
Patchett	Jesse	Wood Rodgers
Perrone	Michael	DWR-DES
Pesavento	David	DWR
Pineda	Ricardo	DWR
Porbaha	Ali	CVFPB
Punia	Jay	Wood Rodgers Inc.
Rabo	Mark	DWR
Roberts	Mike	DWR - FESSRO

Last Name	First Name	Organization
Romero	Paul	DWR
Scarborough	Bob	DWR/FPO
Schoenberg	Steve	USFWS
Shulters	Jackie	AECOM
Siclari	Alessia	UC Davis
Smith	Brian	DWR
Sorgen	KC	SAFCA
Street	Claudia	YSFB
Suarez	Emma	CVFPB
Suen	Darren	DWR
Swanson	Keith	DWR - DFM
Tabor	Ward	DWR - OCC
Tatayon	Susan	TNC
Tice Jr.	Jon P.	CVFPB
Tsai	Eric	DWR
Tull	Rob	CH2M Hill
Waltner	Alan	COAW
Weinrich	Doug	USFWS
Williams	Chris	DWR
Winkler	Ed	CH2M Hill
Winternitz	Leo	GEI
Young	Mark	Westervelt

Appendix C – Outcome-Based Planning Process Graphic

